



## GOVERNOR BECKHAM

KENTUCKY'S YOUNG EXECUTIVE  
—WHAT HE THINKS WE  
OUGHT TO BE THANK-  
FUL FOR.

Gov. Beckham's Thanksgiving proclamation reads like he had just returned from a Methodist revival, and was contemplating going up to the choir of gifts, the Author of all good.

Now the question arises, if the Author of all good has given us such plenty and we are such a happy people, why do we not thank Him more?

TERMS OF THE BLADE.  
1 issue for one year \$1.00.  
5 issues for one year \$2.50.  
10 issues for one year \$1.00.  
100 issues for one year \$25.00.

Terms—\$1.00 per year, in advance.  
In clubs of five, 50 cents; foreign subscription, \$1.50.  
Make all Money Orders, Drafts and Express Orders payable to the Blue Grass Blade, Lexington, Ky.

When you change your address add the title of the office giving your old address as well as the new address.  
When you send your subscription say whether you are a new or old subscriber.

The address slip on the paper will show expiration of subscription, and serve as a receipt as the date changes as soon as the subscriber pays.  
Subscriptions to this publication are not discontinued at expiration unless so ordered by the subscriber. The courts invariably hold a subscriber responsible to the publisher for the subscription price at all papers received until the paper is paid for to full up to date and ordered discontinued.

Office of publication: 161 East Third street, near Walnut.  
Entered at the Post Office at Lexington, Ky., as Second Class Mail.

Address all communications to BLUE GRASS BLADE, P. O. BOX, 283, Lexington, Kentucky.  
Cumberland Telephone, 312.

Club Rates and Sample Copies.  
The Blade will be sent for 50 cents a year each for any order for FIVE or more. Sample copies will be sent free.

### "THE DAMNED THING CALLED ALCOHOL"

I believe that alcohol, to a certain degree, demoralizes those who make it, those who sell it, and those who drink it.  
I believe from the time it issues from the still and poisonous worm of the distillery until it empties into the hell of crime, death and dishonor, it demoralizes everybody that touches it.

I do not believe that anybody can contemplate the subject without becoming prejudiced against this liquid crime.

All you have to do is to think of the death of the suicide of the insanity, of the poverty of the ignorance, of the distress, of the little children tugging at the faded dresses of weeping and despairing wives, asking for bread, of the men of genius who are wrecked; of the millions who have struggled with imaginary serpents produced by this devilish thing.

And when you think of the jails, of the almshouses, of the prisons, and of the scaffolds upon either side, do the wonder that every thoughtful man is prejudiced against the damned stuff called alcohol.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

"Keep Church and State forever separate."—Grant.  
"In no sense whatsoever is this government founded upon either bible or religion."—Washington.  
"The divorce between Church and State should be absolute."—Garfield.

## COLLEGE OF MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course.  
Laboratories fully equipped.  
Abundance of Clinical Material.  
FEES MODERATE.  
Fall term opens in September.  
Write today for Catalog to  
FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., Sec'y  
245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.

They will find it a mine of book lore, presented in most attractive form.  
The current issue, Holiday number, November and December, is immensely valuable. The first article in it, "The Treasures of our National Library," by Louis Fischer, is alone worth a year's subscription.

A pamphlet or two from this article will interest readers of the Blade.

"Many of the books in the Library of Congress were written by crazy people. They are as carefully selected as the wisest drinks. Mr. Stoddard says that it is not a function of a great library to discriminate between the merits of the various productions, but to take of the lot together with the wisdom. Most works of the Library are of the highest quality in form, and a great majority of them are on religious topics. More people go on religion than on any other thing."

This opinion of people going crazy is the opinion of the Library of Congress and he is likely to be proved on vital subjects.

If the readers of the Blade want a literary companion, that will bring them both profit and pleasure they find it in Editor W. C. Price's Book Review.

Versailles, Kentucky.

### ANOTHER VIRGIN.

From the time of the alleged Christ, there have appeared at intervals, men who have claimed to be the Messiah—that they have a divine mission, and that they have a new religion. In the case of the Virgin Mary, they claim that they have a new religion, that they have a new God, and that they have a new Messiah. They claim that they have a new religion, that they have a new God, and that they have a new Messiah. They claim that they have a new religion, that they have a new God, and that they have a new Messiah.

The question has frequently been asked "What would Jesus do if he were here today?"

The question of the question of what Jesus would do is not so difficult as it appears. It is not so difficult as it appears. It is not so difficult as it appears.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

These Donkeshites were colonized in America through the efforts of the Virgin Mary. They claim to be the Virgin Mary, and they claim to be the Virgin Mary.

## WALTER HURT

IS FOR THE WOMAN IN THE CASE  
—SAME HERE.

From the specialization and lionization of the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

While the Presbyterian press one might easily suppose that ignorance and superstition have but one chance for a second.

## THE LEXINGTON CONGRESS

PLEASE SEND IN YOUR NAMES  
SAYING YOU WILL BE THERE  
IF YOU POSSIBLY CAN

I hope it will be thoroughly understood that the Congress of the National Liberal Party, at Lexington, Kentucky, on November 23, 24, 25, 1902, is not solely for those who are members of the National Liberal Party, or even exclusively for those who are religious.

Of course we want all to become members of the organization, but, of course, only such, unless there is a consensus of the rules, can take part in the discussion of the floor, but the invitation is to all who will honor us with their presence.

I would be glad if all who may expect to come would notify the Blade.

### CONFIRMING WHAT I SAID

In writing about Wm's Farewell, I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

I said that I had a great deal to say about it. I said that I had a great deal to say about it.

# THE JOURNAL

## TO GREAT WOMAN

OUTDOOR ART LEAGUE PAYS  
TRIBUTE TO LATE MRS.  
STANTON.

The California Outdoor Art League adopted yesterday the following memorial to the late Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

In Memoriam.  
Elizabeth Cady Stanton has passed from her labors. Full of years and hours, she has hidden under to earth and journeyed to the unknown, leaving a record without blemish, and an example that will be a stimulus to the daughters of this and of future generations. With all the charm of femininity, she combined a masculine strength, she could perceive intuitively and she could reason logically. She could persuade and she could command. In speech and in writing she could turn thought into words that inspired thoughts of power, carrying conviction to the heart and leaving a record that gladdened the hearts of those with whom she came in contact. From Maine to California, from Texas to Utah, she was a woman and a woman without number whose hearts will beat heavily and whose eyes will weep for the passing away of Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Resolved, That the California Outdoor Art League, and that a copy be sent to the friends of the family.

MRS. LOVELL WHITE,  
MRS. H. L. PARKER,  
MRS. EDWARD F. GLASER,  
Committee.

MAGAZINE—METHUSELAH  
AND DOG FENNEL

Charlottesville, Va., Nov. 15, '02.  
Brother Moore:

Set me down for 5 copies of your Dog Fennel Suburbs.

I have both of your books and nearly all issues of the Blade keeping to bind.

Don't waste your substance in riotous publication. Put efforts on the paper, if there is anything more can be done to it.

A friend and I are planning to be at the meeting in Lexington, Va. Have only just read your attempt to explain Mrs. Henry's remarkable statement about Methuselah's age, and the flood. Such errors as this do harm, giving a false impression to the handle to an accusation that free thinkers deliberately falsify.

Had you been careful you would have seen (Gen. 5, 21) that Methuselah is said to have been born in 3210 B. C. The date you give is 3210 years after that. The year of the flood 2345 before the age of Methuselah, 969 makes 2345, a difference of 375 years instead of 188 years. And this is but the printer's marginal note, if you will follow the text you will find no such discrepancy. It says (verse 21) that Methuselah was 187 years old when Lamech was born and Noah was 600 years old at the flood. Now that Methuselah died the year of the flood.

But let me suggest to Mrs. Henry or whoever has taken the opportunity to investigate that an author who claims to be a Hebrew scholar, says that in the Bible Methuselah is set down at 969 years, and that our translators to avoid the very obvious discrepancy of his age, making it out of 11 years of his age, making it out of the flood.

TOM SWINBURN.

### ANSWER

I want to publish the Magazine to help pay for the Lino. The principal part of the cost of the Magazine is the type setting, and as the Magazine is to be made up principally of what has already been said in the paper, the Blade Magazine would cost me much less to get out than other magazines cost—probably not more than half as much—and be just as good as any of the others and have nearly twice as much in it as any of the others. So that if friends of the Blade want to help Mr. Hughes to pay for the lino the thing to do is to get all of them to subscribe for the Magazine.

Give us 3,000 subscribers for the Magazine and we will pay for the lino at once. Give us 5,000 which you ought to do and we will give you the most beautiful stationery Magazine that ever was printed in the United States and the Blade will stand at once, be put in every circulation.

I do hope that certainly and without any failure the 200 subscribers for the Magazine will come in as a New Year's present for Mr. Hughes.

Of course you will need more of what I say if you will think a minute. With the type setting for the Magazine already ordered and all the appliances for getting it out already in our possession, the cost of getting out the Magazine would be at a rough estimate about one-third of what it would be if we did nothing but print the Magazine.

I am glad you are coming to the Lexington Convention and that the smaller news will come to us from everywhere.

Now as to old man Methuselah. Col. Crockett, you remember, said: "Be sure you are right, then go ahead," but you are not right, and you are right before you go ahead.

"I do not at all claim that Mrs. Henry is right or that she is as reliable as her own claim infallibility there is

no reason why, if either of us is in error, Christians may not think we are honestly mistaken, just as they frequently are."

I have a very fine Bible that cost \$13.00 and it does not say any more, says what you say the Bible says.

By no kind of construction that anybody can put upon it does it say, as you affirm that Genesis 5, 21 says that Methuselah was born 3210 B. C. and there is an indication from the chronology printed on its margin that 2310 (B. C.) is the date of Lamech's birth (verse 25). The year 3210 B. C. that you give does not at all appear in my Bible, and the nearest date to the birth of Methuselah that I can get in it, is 3210 B. C.

Your language is as follows: "It says (verse 21) that Methuselah was 187 years old when Lamech was born, and Lamech was 182 years old when Noah was born and Noah was 600 years old at the flood." You, of course, meant to say that verse 25, said Methuselah was 187 years old when Lamech was born. Then you say plainly that Noah was "600 years old" when he was born, and that he made 969 years the age of Methuselah, but the age of Noah, he says, was 600 years, and the age of Methuselah was 969 years.

The reason I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

# METHUSELAH

## IS STILL GIVING TROUBLE—A BLADE MAN SAYS HE "GOT IT IN THE NECK"

Park River, N. D., Nov. 11, '02.  
Charles C. Moore:

Dear Sir:—Enclosed find \$4.25 for my subscription, and for "Dog Fennel" and for the Magazine, and Wilson's Poems, and 25 cents for exchange on the Blade.

Referring to an article in the Blade of Oct. 26, "Mrs. Henry and Methuselah," you say, "if you look at Genesis 5, 23 in my Bible that it has chronology printed at the top you will find that Methuselah was born B. C. 3210."

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

I write this is I had a little argument with a friend as to the Bible not being right and I showed him the Bible, with the old article and he read it. He said he did not believe it and got the Bible and found it up and found it was a mistake, and I got it in the B. C.

Now I have looked up several histories and I find it is the Art, one 27, of that chapter: O. K. In Genesis 7, 1, you say the ark called it O. K. 2345, and did it called it O. K. one which would make Methuselah 969 years old.

to show that I was the author of the part that I keep standing in the way of some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:

"Hundreds of times I have disclaimed the authorship of this piece, and I have told some other party, and known to him added to it about twice as much more. Ingersoll's letter ends with:





